

TAXONOMIC NOTES ON SOME NEARCTIC RHOPALOCERA

1. HESPERIOIDEA

by CYRIL F. DOS PASSOS

INTRODUCTION

The object of the present paper is to explain briefly the systematic changes that will be incorporated in the forthcoming Check List of Nearctic Rhopalocera and to give the reasons therefor.

Contrary to the present practice, the Check List will proceed from the lower butterflies, the Hesperioidea, to the higher, the Papilionoidea, and the same system will be followed within those super-families in the arrangement of the families, subfamilies, and genera. This is believed to be the most scientific approach to the problem.

In the Hesperioidea the result is the complete reversal of the order of subfamilies as well as the genera used by EVANS (1951-1955). As a result the List will commence with Megathymidæ to be followed by Hesperiidæ, with Hesperiinæ, Pyrginæ, and Pyrrhopyginæ in that order. The genera throughout will be those employed by EVANS with the exception of one name (*Urbanus*), that has been invalidated by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Opinion 278) since the publication of his work.

There will be a number of changes in the systematic arrangement of the species followed by EVANS, because it is quite evident from an examination of his Catalogue that the British Museum (Natural History) does not have an extensive collection of Nearctic hesperiids and among those that it does have there are unfortunately some mislabeled specimens. This has at times led EVANS astray.

A number of typographical errors in EVANS' work will be corrected in these notes. Many such errors have been corrected already in the "Addenda and Corrigenda to Parts I and II" of his work (1953, pt.3, pp.233-234) and in Appendix II "Addenda and Corrigenda to Parts I, II and III," (1955, pt.4, pp.475-478), and in a four-page "Addenda and Corrigenda to the 'Catalogue of American Hesperiidæ'" published by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History), my copy thereof having been received on 10 September 1956, but there are still other errors which will be corrected herein. The attention of students is called to these important corrections.

There is an abstract of EVANS' work by BELLINGER (*Lepid. News* 10: 60-65; 1956) listing all new names proposed by EVANS and giving the type species of the generic names. This is most useful for quick reference.

The arrangement of the Papilionoidea will follow the same system as above outlined, but in this case in accordance more or less with WARREN'S (1947) plan, *i.e.*, it will start with the Papilionidæ and end with the Satyridæ, those being considered respectively the lowest and highest families. It

must be confessed that there is much more room for differences of opinion respecting the proper arrangement of the intervening families, their sub-families and genera. However, since these are subjective matters on which it is impossible to please everyone, it has been considered best to follow WARREN especially since the latest important work on this subject by EHRlich (1959) agrees in most respects with his conclusions. Within the genera McDUNNOUGH's (1938) listing of the species has been followed except where it has been possible to make some slight improvement or genera have since been revised.

It is hoped that the above fundamental changes, which may seem somewhat radical at first, will establish the Nearctic list of Butterflies on a firm basis from which there should be no necessity for any substantial changes in the future. No new names are proposed in these notes, but some names are elevated or reduced in rank or sunk in the synonymy.

In recent years there has been a strong tendency among some authors, mostly European, to erect many new or revise some old generic names, usually for a very small number of species. Insofar as the Holarctic species are concerned, this splitting of genera has been done mostly by NABOKOV in the Plebejinæ, REUSS in the Argynninæ, and WARREN in the Pyrginæ and Argynninæ. While the practice of splitting genera has merit in pointing out differences between heretofore considered closely related species, it has been considered best in the Check List to give most of these new or resurrected names subgeneric standing only, thus following the practice adopted by KLOTS (1951). Such a procedure gives recognition to these names and permits any student to use them as full genera, if so desired.

A few words must be added concerning the Règles Internationales de Nomenclature Zoologique. These Règles, originally adopted at Berlin in 1901, were comparatively simple until amended at Paris in 1948. Their text until then will be found in 1958 *Bulletin Zoological Nomenclature* 14: pp.IX-XXVIII. At Paris an effort was made to amend the Règles so as to cover almost every conceivable contingency by a rule or a recommendation. The Règles adopted at that Congress (1948) were never published in final form although the Secretary of the Commission was directed to do so, (*Bulletin Zoological Nomenclature* 4: 78, 342; 1950).

At the next Congress held at Copenhagen in 1953 more or less under the same influences, the Règles were amended again and considerably amplified in a still more determined effort to cover every possible contingency. Again the Secretary of the Commission was directed (CDZN. 98-103) to publish the draft text of the Règles, which was assigned to Professor BRADLEY for reduction. This excellent "draft" was published prior to the Zoological Congress held in London in 1958 (*Bulletin Zoological Nomenclature* 14: 1-286; 1957). Another Colloquium was held a week ahead of that Congress at which the Règles were again substantially and radically revised. When the results of that Congress will be published has not been announced but it has not yet been done.

As a result of this brief history of the Règles, it can be seen that they are in a somewhat chaotic condition. No one knows the exact text. Decisions taken by the Commission prior to 1948 as well as at that time have been revised and some even reversed; decisions taken in 1953 will presumably be again revised and some reversed. In addition the Règles have become so long, complicated and involved that even the proverbial "Philadelphia lawyer" cannot understand them in all their detail and much valuable time is wasted in trying to solve the most simple problems.

In this paper and in the Check List an effort will be made to comply with the Règles. The principle of priority will be adhered to strictly. The original spelling of a name will be used unless obviously a *lapsus calami*.

In this country for nearly half a century entomologists have enjoyed the benefit of an excellent Entomological Code of Nomenclature published by BANKS and CAUDELL (1912). This Code is clear and simple. In the writer's opinion it has worked well in practice and is preferable to the International Règles in their present state of complexity and flux. It will be followed in these notes and the Check List, except in those cases where it has been modified by the Règles.

I am indebted to my colleague, Mr. ERNEST L. BELL, SR., of Flushing, New York, for much valuable advice and assistance in the Hesperioidea and for permission to use his complete card index of the genera and species of the new world hesperiids. Also to Professor ALEXANDER B. KLOTS, of Pelham, New York, for help in the Pieridæ and *Boloria*. Their interest and encouragement in this work have been of great aid to me. I am greatly obliged also to Mr. PADDY B. MCHENRY, of Burbank, California, who, in the course of preparing a compilation of the original descriptions of Nearctic Rhopalocera, has run across many perplexing problems of spellings, authorships, dates of publication, etc. He has most kindly placed his notes on these matters at my disposal with permission to use the same. I must also express my thanks to Dr. PAUL R. EHRLICH of Stanford, California, for advice on the arrangement of families and genera and for going over my *ms.* and pointing out some errors therein. He has been most kind and generous in his help. Many others, too numerous to mention here, have had the kindness to answer questions about various matters that arose from time to time. To them my thanks are expressed also.

These notes do not include all changes in dates and authorships, of which quite a few will appear in the Check List, mainly as a result of five papers published recently by the author in *The Lepidopterists' News*. Such changes would not seem to require any special documentation since the results generally follow a careful check of the names in the literature and are explained in these five papers.

We proceed now to the discussion of all systematic changes which are not already explained in the literature or conveniently found by those who do not have the entire literature at their command, first promising that the author would be pleased to hear from all those having differences of opinion respecting these notes, especially if their inquiries are documented.

TAXONOMIC NOTES

MEGATHYMIIDÆ

EVANS (1955, p.464), followed by J. A. COMSTOCK (1956), has reduced this name to a subfamily name (Megathyminae). In this the present work BARNES and McDUNNOUGH (1912) and McDUNNOUGH (1938) and KLOTS (1951) have been followed. There appears to be sufficient reason to consider these insects as constituting a family as explained by the last two authors.

Megathymus yuccæ Boisduval & LeConte, "1833" [1834]. This name was mentioned first by BOISDUVAL and LECONTE, as *Eudamus?* *yuccæ*. If that was not a valid publication because of the question mark after the generic name, the author is WALKER (1856, p.1583), who placed the species in *Castnia*. However, the publication by BOISDUVAL and LECONTE is considered valid.

Megathymus alabamæ H. A. Freeman, 1943. In giving this name sub-specific rank under *yuccæ*, EVANS (1955, p.467) overlooked the fact that FREEMAN had sunk it as a synonym (1952, p.30). FREEMAN has been followed, and EVANS (*in litt.*) later corrected this error.

Megathymus ursus violæ Stallings & Turner, 1956. During the past several years the descriptions of a number of new species of *Megathymus* have been published by STALLINGS and TURNER as well as by other authors. These are based upon differences in pattern, genitalia, and especially the food plants upon which the larvæ were found or reared. Having examined the genitalia of several species of *Megathymus* E. L. BELL and the writer found that they differ considerably from specimen to specimen in the same species and the conclusion has been reached that some of the new species may in fact be subspecies. In this case the authors themselves have suggested that *violæ* may be a subspecies of *ursus* and that suggestion has been adopted in giving it sub-specific rank.

Megathymus aryxna Dyar, 1905. The correct taxonomic position of this name has been the subject of differences of opinion (Stallings & Turner 1954, p.77; Bell & dos Passos 1954, pp.1-5; and dos Passos & Bell 1955, pp. 289-294). This problem has been decided by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. That decision fixes the lectotype of this name as the species figured by DRUCE in Godman & Salvin (vol.3, p.69, f.4) and not one of the specimens in the United States National Museum.

HESPERIIDÆ

HESPERIINÆ

Panoquina wimico (Plötz), 1883. EVANS (1955, p.403) ascribes this name to GODMAN, (1907) "(Plötz MS)" but its publication earlier by Plötz in the synonymy of *P. panoquin* is valid. It is therefore ascribed to that author.

Amblyscirtes hegon (Scudder), 1863. This name has been sunk by EVANS (1955, p.389) for *A. samoset* (Scudder), 1863 on the theory that as

the first reviser SCUDDER (1872) took that action, thus upsetting well-established usage but in accordance with the present Règles.

Atrytonopsis hianna turneri H. A. Freeman, 1948. There is sufficient difference between specimens from Massachusetts and Kansas, the respective type localities of these insects, to justify giving subspecific standing to *turneri*.

Atrytonopsis cestus (Edwards), 1884. This name is given specific standing. EVANS may not have had anything before him but *A. python*. Both are rare in collections, especially *cestus*. The hyaline spots are not the same color in these insects.

Atrytonopsis ovinia edwardsi Barnes & McDunnough, 1916. EVANS (1955, p.386) places *zaovinia* Dyar, 1913 described from Mexico as a subspecies of *A. ovinia* with *edwardsi* as a synonym. Examination of specimens in the American Museum of Natural History collection shows that *edwardsi* is entitled to subspecific rank, and *zaovinia* is omitted from the List as not being a Nearctic insect.

Euphyes conspicua buchholzi (Ehrlich & Gillham), 1951. This name, sunk by EVANS (1955, p.363), warrants subspecific standing as a large, well-marked population occurring in Nebraska and other western states from which EVANS appears to have had no material.

Euphyes vestris (Boisduval), 1852 and *E. v. metacomet* (Harris), 1862. These names were proposed for specimens from California and Massachusetts respectively, ends of an east-west cline, and appear sufficiently distinct to warrant subspecific standing. This fact was recognized by KLOTS (1951, p.259), who removed *metacomet* from the synonymy.

Poanes massasoit hughii Clark, 1931 and *P. m. suffusa* (Laurent), 1892. EVANS (1955, p.345) appears to have had no specimen from Maryland, the type locality of *hughii*. These specimens differ sufficiently to warrant subspecific standing. Also form *suffusa* (Laurent), 1892 is recognized as a distinct form occurring in isolated colonies in the southern range of the species.

Poanes hobomok f. ♀ *pocahontas* (Scudder), 1863. While EVANS does not recognize form names, in the present author's opinion they are of value when clearly distinct, consequently, the dark female of *hobomok* is recognized as form ♀ *pocahontas*.

Poanes aaroni howardi Skinner, 1896. This insect is recognized as the subspecies of *aaroni* occurring in Florida. EVANS (1955, p.346) appears to have had only two females from Florida and therefore may not have been in a position to judge the validity of the name.

Poanes baiva (Evans), 1955. This name, ascribed to "(Boisduval MS)" by EVANS (1955, p. 346) was included by BUTLER (1870) among species of *Pamphila*, but without any description or being placed in any particular synonymy. It appears therefore to have been a *nomen nudum* until published by EVANS in the synonymy of *P. yehl* Skinner, 1893.

Ochlodes yuma (Edwards), "1872-3" (1873). This insect placed by EVANS (1955, p.343) as a subspecies of *O. sylvanoides* (Boisduval), 1852 has been given specific standing. EVANS appears to have had one specimen

only from Olancho, California, whereas the type was described from Arizona.

Atrytone logan lagus (Edwards), 1881. EVANS (1955, p.340) mistook the type locality of *logan* as "Philadelphia", whereas it is Lansing, Michigan. *A. l. lagus* was described from Texas and is sufficiently distinct to warrant subspecific standing.

Pompeius verna sequoyah (H. A. Freeman), 1942. This insect is considered sufficiently different from the nominate subspecies to warrant subspecific rank. It is accordingly removed from the synonymy of *P. verna*, where EVANS (1955, p.336) places it.

Wallengrenia otho Smith, 1797. This species has caused considerable difficulty. It is not correctly listed by McDUNNOUGH (1938, p.34) or by EVANS (1955, pp.332, 333). In the first place *drury* (= *drurii* and *druryi*) (Latreille), "1819" [1824] is not the correct specific name, as conceded by EVANS ("1955" [1956], p.218). The correct name is *otho* and *drury* does not occur in the Nearctic region but occurs as a subspecies in Hispaniola, St. Thomas, and Porto Rico. In the second place, *pustula* Geyer, 1832 is not a subspecies but a synonym of *otho otho*. While we are not concerned with *curassavica* (Snellen), 1886 because probably it does not occur in our faunal region it should be pointed out that its two synonyms, *lacordairii* Godman, 1900 and *jobrea* Dyar, 1919, should be omitted also from the List. The underside of the secondaries of Mexican specimens are yellowish and not reddish as are specimens from the southern United States. *W. curassavica* was recorded by H. A. FREEMAN (1950, p.78) from Texas, but the record is omitted by EVANS (1955). According to BELL (1946, p.140) it is a subspecies of *W. otho*. It is not included in the List with its synonym *winslowi* Weeks, 1906.

Wallengrenia aetna (Boisduval), 1870. This name listed by McDUNNOUGH (1938, p.34) as a synonym of *Catia otho egeremet* is omitted from the List. It appears to have been a misidentification by SCUDDER (1889, p.1696). The insect was described from Sicily and is included by EVANS (1949, p.431) in his catalogue of the Hesperioidea from Europe etc.

Polites enys Scudder, 1889. EVANS (1955, p.332) calls attention to the fact that *Pamphila enys* Butler (1870) is a *nomen nudum* and ascribes the name to LINDSEY, BELL and WILLIAMS (1931). However, the next valid use of this name was by SCUDDER (1889, p.1683) when he placed it in the synonymy of *P. peckius* Kirby (1837).

Polites sabuleti chusca (Edwards), "1872-3" (1873). This name, placed in the synonymy of *P. s. sabuleti* (Boisduval), 1852 by EVANS (1955, p.331) is given subspecific standing as the result of an examination of a long series of specimens from the type locality in the American Museum of Natural History. EVANS appears to have seen no specimens from Arizona, the type locality.

Polites sabuleti tecumseh (Grinnell), 1903. This name, given subspecific standing by EVANS (1955, p.331) has been placed in the synonymy of *P. sabuleti* (Boisduval), 1852.

Polites sabuleti mardon (Edwards), 1881 and *P. s. draco* (Edwards), "1870-1" (1871). These names have been given specific standing. EVANS appears to have seen no specimen of the former.

Polites manataaqua Scudder, 1863. This name, usually ascribed to HARRIS, 1862, has been credited to SCUDDER by EVANS (1955, p.328), which is correct.

Polites siris (Edwards), 1881. This name has been removed by the author as a subspecies of *P. mystic* (Scudder), (1863) and given specific standing. It does not appear to be related to *mystic*.

Polites combinata Plötz, 1883. The author of this name is PLOTZ, 1883 and not GODMAN, 1907 as given by EVANS (1955, p.326). It is a synonym of *P. v. praeceps* (Scudder) (1872, p.79) and does not occur in North America.

Hesperia comma ochracea Lindsey, 1941. This name, proposed for a form of *colorado*, is given subspecific standing as a subspecies of *comma* (Linnæus), 1758.

Hesperia comma ruricola Boisduval, 1852. This name has been transferred to *H. comma* (Linnæus), 1758 as a subspecies, replacing *H. harpalus* (Edwards), 1881 in accordance with the advice of BELL and EVANS (*in litt.*).

Hesperia comma yosemite (Leussler), 1933. This name, sunk by EVANS (1955, p.319) as a synonym of *harpalus* (Edwards), 1881 is given subspecific standing as a race of *comma* and removed from the synonymy of *harpalus*.

Hesperia colorado f. leussleri Lindsey, 1940. This name, sunk by EVANS (1955, p.319) as a synonym of *harpalus*, is given subspecific standing as a race of *H. comma* (Linnæus), 1758.

Hesperia pahaska williamsi Lindsey, 1940. This name, proposed as a form of *pahaska* Leussler, 1938 and sunk by EVANS (1955, p.321) as clinal, is removed from the synonymy and placed as a subspecies. The author sees nothing wrong with clinal names, especially when they come from the center or the ends of a cline.

Hesperia pawnee montana (Skinner), 1911. This name, sunk by EVANS (1955, p.322) as a synonym of *H. pawnee* Dodge, 1874 is given subspecific standing. It represents a very dark population occurring in Colorado. (See *Ent. news* 32: 206; 1921).

Hesperia sassacus manitoboides (Fletcher), 1889. This name, sunk by EVANS (1955, p.323) apparently without an examination of any specimen, is restored to subspecific standing.

Hesperia attalus seminole (Scudder), 1872. This name proposed for Floridian specimens was sunk by EVANS (1955, p.323) as a synonym of *attalus* but that species was described from Waco, Texas, and EVANS appears to have had no typical material before him. Specimens from Florida being somewhat different, the name is restored to the List as a subspecies.

Hesperia liberia Plötz, 1883. It is somewhat doubtful where this name should be placed. The type is lost or destroyed and the description is unsatisfactory. Not even a type locality is given. Probably it is a synonym of *H. leonardus* Harris, 1862, where it appears best to place it for the time being.

Hylephila phyleus (Drury), "1770" [1773]. This name has been written usually "*phylæus*", but that was not the original spelling and there is no apparent reason for changing it. Phyleus was the son of Augeas whose stable Hercules cleansed.

Hylephila phyleus f. pallida Hayward, 1944. This name is recognized as a valid form name for a nearly white aberration. While the type was collected in Argentina, such a form could occur in North America.

Thymelicus lineola f. pallida Tutt, 1896. EVANS overlooked the occurrence of this form in the Nearctic region. The name was proposed for a specimen from Europe, but the form has been reported from Michigan by CLENCH (1948, p.105).

Copaodes Edwards, 1877. EVANS (1955, p.307) ascribes this name to SPEYER. It may be that SPEYER is responsible for the description but it is not clear from EDWARDS' paper that SPEYER is responsible also for the name. If so it should be cited "Speyer in Edwards, 1877." In the meanwhile, it seems best to retain EDWARDS as the author.

Perichares philetus adela (Hewitson), 1867. This subspecies, incorrectly dated by EVANS (1955, p.254) as "1871" has priority over *dolores* Reakirt, 1868. Consequently *dolores* is placed in the synonymy.

Eutyche complana (Herrich-Schäffer), 1869. EVANS (1955, p.198) records a specimen from "Texas." This locality is highly improbable and requires verification before the name is added to the Nearctic List.

Cymænes tripunctus theogenis (Capronnier), 1874. EVANS (1955, p.129) lists five specimens, one from "Idaho" and four from "Colorado" under this name, but it is believed that they are mislabeled. For that reason *C. t. theogenis* is omitted from the List.

Cymænes odilia trebius Mabille, 1891. This appears to be the insect determined by H. A. FREEMAN (1945, p.103) as "*Lerodea edata* (Plötz)", 1883. The name *edata* is now applied to a subspecies of *odilia* occurring in South America.

Pyrrhocalles utha Hewitson, 1868. This name, placed by EVANS (1955, p.81) as a synonym of *P. antiqua*, is omitted from the List with that name as explained below.

Pyrrhocalles antiqua (Herrich-Schäffer), 1863. McDUNNOUGH (1938), lists *Pemiades antiqua* with *P. jamaicensis* Schaus, 1902 as a synonym. According to BELL (*in litt.*) these are distinct species now transferred to *Pyrrhocalles*. The former was described from "Cuba", later claimed to be from Haiti (Evans, 1955, p.81), and the latter from Jamaica. It is very doubtful whether either species occurs in the Nearctic region. The Nearctic records of *antiqua* and *jamaicensis* are believed to be false. Until further light is thrown on this problem *P. jamaicensis* will be retained in the List but preceded by an asterisk and *P. antique Auctorum* placed as a synonym.

Pemiades jamaicensis Barnes & Benjamin, 1926 *nec* Schaus, 1902. As explained above, this record for the United States is from a mislabelled specimen of *P. jamaicensis* Schaus which was described from Jamaica and not from the Nearctic region. See Bell, 1938, p.H-32 and Evans, 1955, p.81.

Synapte malitiosa pecta Evans, 1955. H. A. FREEMAN'S record (1945, p.103) of "*Godmania malitiosa* (Herrich-Schäffer)", 1865, from Texas should be referred to this subspecies.

Carterocephalus palamon mesapano (Scudder), 1868. This name is given subspecific standing. It was described from Maine, whereas *C. mandan* (Edwards), "1863-4" (1863), was described from Lake Winnipeg, and the two populations differ sufficiently to justify recognition of each.

PYRGINÆ

Pholisora libya (Scudder), 1878. EVANS (1953, p.232) states erroneously that the type locality of this insect is "Utah." In fact, it is Beaver Dam, Arizona. He places *P. lena* (Edwards), 1882, in the synonymy. This population, described from Minta, Montana, is sufficiently distinct to warrant subspecific standing.

Heliopetes laviana leca Butler, 1870. This name is omitted because it is a subspecies of *H. laviana*, which does not occur in the Nearctic region.

Heliopetes nivella (Mabille), 1883. This name, listed by McDUNNOUGH (1938, p.31) as a subspecies of *H. macaira* (Reakirt), 1866, was described from Bogota, Colombia. It, together with its synonym *nivca* Scudder, 1872, is omitted from the Check List as not Nearctic.

Heliopetes sublinea Schaus, 1902. This name, listed by EVANS (1953, p.225) as a questionable synonym of *H. macaira* Reakirt, was described from Mexico. According to Bell (*in litt.*) it is a species closely allied to *H. domicella* (Erichson), 1848 but has not been recorded from the Nearctic region. It is accordingly omitted from the Check List.

Pyrgus caespitatis (Boisduval), 1852. This is the original spelling of the specific name. In 1869 BOISDUVAL published the name *Syrichtus caespitatis* both in the text and in the index of his paper. It is not known whether this was intended as an emendation of *caespitatis* or was a *lapsus calami*. The word does not appear to be derived from the Latin or Greek languages. Either spelling would appear to form a proper Latin word. While the second spelling has been employed by most authors, since no reason for an emendation is apparent the original spelling will be used in the Check List in accordance with the usual practice followed therein.

Pyrgus xanthus Edwards, 1878. Although EVANS (1953, p.218) has placed this insect as a subspecies of *P. ruralis* (Boisduval), 1852, F. MARTIN BROWN of Colorado Springs, Colorado, advises (*in litt.*) that they fly together at that place, and both he and Mr. BELL consider them specifically distinct. Hence they are so treated in the List. EVANS' date of publication "1873" is erroneous.

Pyrgus ruralis macdunnoughi (Oberthür), 1913. EVANS (1953, p. 218) has given this name subspecific standing. BELL (*in litt.*) believes that it is a form of *xanthus* as it has been treated usually. In the List it is relegated to that position as a form of *xanthus*.

Erynnis rutilius Evans, 1953. This name is ascribed to MEAD (1875, p.787) by EVANS (1953, p.208), but lacking an indication etc., it was a *nomen nudum*. It is next mentioned by LINTNER (1878, p.176) but not in a way to constitute a valid publication. EVANS' mention of the name in the synonymy of *persius* constitutes a publication, since the Règles changing the practice of recognizing as valid names published in synonymies, adopted at Copenhagen in 1953, had not become effective at that time.

Erynnis persius fredericki H. A. Freeman, 1943. This subspecies of *persius* has been placed in the synonymy by EVANS (1953, p.208) with an interrogation mark. It would seem better to retain it as a subspecies. The western population of *persius* is quite distinct from that occurring in the East.

Erynnis baptisiae (Forbes), 1936. This insect has been placed by EVANS (1953, p.208) as a subspecies of *lucilius* (Scudder & Burgess), 1870. It would appear better to retain it as a closely related species.

Erynnis propertius (Scudder & Burgess), 1870. This name is treated as a species and not as a subspecies of *E. juvenalis* (Fabricius), 1793, in accordance with the advice of BELL and EVANS (*in litt.*).

Erynnis callidus Grinnell, 1904. EVANS (1953, p.207) treats this as a subspecies of *brizo*. Here it is placed as a subspecies of *pacuvius* (Lintner), 1878. (See dos Passos, 1947, p. 1.)

Ephyriades zephodes (Hübner), "1806" [1825]. This name is listed by McDUNNOUGH (1938, p.31) but omitted from the Check List because the insect is not found in the Nearctic region.

Achlyodes thraso (Hübner), "1806" [1807]. The nymotypical form does not occur north of Mexico. *A. t. tamenund* (Edwards), "1870-1" (1871), described from Texas and differing from *thraso* has, therefore, been removed from the synonymy where placed by EVANS (1953, p.172) and recognized as a valid subspecies.

Xenophanes ruatensis Godman & Salvin, (1895). This name, placed by EVANS (1953, p.155) in the synonymy of *X. trixus* Stoll, 1782, is omitted from the List on the advice of BELL (*in litt.*), who believes that it is a valid subspecies not occurring in our fauna.

Gorgythion begga Prittwitz, 1886. This name cited by EVANS (1953, p.100) is a *nomen nudum*, not having been proposed as a binominal. The first author to use the name properly is KIRBY (1870), to whom it must be ascribed.

Pellicia costimacula Herrich-Schäffer, 1870. The insect recorded by H. A. FREEMAN (1951, p.17) from Texas under the above name is *P. angra* Evans, (1953, p.59). It was determined from Godman & Salvin (1894) pl.83, ff.16, 17, 18, but EVANS (1953, p.58) claims correctly that the first two (ff.16, 17) are *arina* and the last (f.18) *angra*.

Cogia Butler, 1870. ORFILA and ROSSI (1956, p.29) sink *Cogia* as a homonym of *Kogia* Gray, 1846, claiming that WALLACE (1876, p.208) emended *Kogia* to *Cogia*. Perhaps this action was a typographical error but if intended as an emendation it appears to have been an unjustified one and should not be permitted to upset an earlier name that was properly proposed.

Generic names that differ from each other by a single letter are not homonyms although there were exceptions to this Règle between 1948 and 1953. Since the action by WALLACE was taken prior to the former date and there is no evidence that *Cogia* and *Kogia* are of the same origin and meaning, the action of ORFILA and ROSSI is not followed.

Thorybes bathyllus Smith, 1797. EVANS (1952, p.130) uses *daunus* (Cramer), "1779" [1777], for this species. CRAMER's figure is a very poor illustration of any species of *Thorybes*. Consequently, this change in the nomenclature has not been followed and is now confirmed by EVANS (*in litt.*).

Thorybes pylades Scudder, (1870). Mr. PADDY B. MCHENRY of Burbank, California, has called the author's attention (*in litt.*) to a name which may have priority over *pylades* but has not been used for over one hundred years. It is deemed best not to revive such a name and to apply to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for its suppression.

Nascus Watson, 1893. The species listed under this name by McDUNNOUGH (1938, p.29) has been transferred to *Dyscophellus* Godman & Salvin (1893). This generic name is not used in the List.

Astrartes Hübner, "1816" [1819]. HEMMING (1934, p.158) claims that the type of this genus, *Papilio aulestis* Cramer, "1782" [1780], is a homonym of *Papilio aulestes* Cramer "1779" [1776], but that is an error. This name appears first in *De Uitlandsche Kapellen* (vol.2, p.47), where it is invalid, because not a binominal. In the index to that volume (p.147) it is written "*Pap. Pleb. ural. aulestes*" with a reference to the plate and figure (this reference applying also to the text) and is, therefore, valid but dating from 1776 when the index was published. This insect is a Lemoniinæ. The next use of *aulestes* by CRAMER (vol.3, p.161) is also invalid, because again it is not a binominal. As before, this name must be dated from the index (p.173) where CRAMER emended the name to *aulestis*, probably having in mind the prior use of *aulestes*. Here the name is written "*Pap. pleb. Urbicol. aulestis*" and is valid from the date of publication of the index 1780. This insect is a hesperiid and the one with which the Check List is concerned.

Urbanus Hübner [1806] (Opinion 278). This generic name employed by EVANS (1952, p.85) has been rejected by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Opinion 278) and must be replaced by *Goniurus* Hübner, "1816" [1819]. The type species of this genus is also *Papilio proteus* Linnæus, (1758), so there is no change in the conception.

Urbanus proteus ab. *proteoides*. This name, spelled by EVANS (1952, p.86) "*protoides*", is placed by him as a subspecies of *U. p. domingo* Scudder, 1872. The insect does not occur in our fauna and is omitted from the List.

Polygonus leo savigny (Latreille), "1819" [1824]. This subspecies is omitted from the List because it does not occur in our fauna.

Polygonus lividus Hübner, [1825]. COMSTOCK (1944, pp.541-2) fixed the type locality of *lividus* as Hispaniola. It should therefore be removed from the synonymy of *P. leo* where EVANS (1952, p.54) places it and supplant *ishmael* Evans (*ibid.* p.54) as the Haitian subspecies. It is not in the List.

Proteides mercurius sanantonio (Lucas), 1857. This insect has been added to the Nearctic List on the advice of MR. CHARLES P. KIMBALL (*in litt.*) who reports a specimen from Florida, most probably a stray from Cuba.

Phocides Hübner, "1816" [1819]. The type is *P. cruentus* Hübner, "1816" [1819], which is not a *nomen nudum* as claimed by EVANS (1952, p.7).

Phocides pigmalion batabano Lucas, 1857. This insect described from Cuba is omitted from the List on the strength of EVANS' (1952, p.14) statement that the Nearctic subspecies occurring in Florida is *okeechobee* Worthington, 1881.

Phocides pigmalion mancinus Herrich-Schäffer, 1862. This name is a synonym of *P. batabano* Lucas, 1857, and is omitted with that subspecies for the same reason.

References

- Banks, N., & A. N. Caudell, 1912. *The entomological code. A code of nomenclature for use in entomology.* 32 pp. Judd & Detweiler, Inc., Washington, D. C.
- Barnes, W., & J. H. McDunnough, 1912. Revision of the Megathymidæ. *Contrib. nat. hist. Lepid. N. Amer.* vol.1, no.3: 56pp., 6 pls., 1 fig.
- Bell, E. L., 1938. A catalogue of the original descriptions of the Rhopalocera found north of the Mexican border. The Hesperioidea. *Bull. Cheyenne Mt. mus.*, vol.1, pt.1: 36 pp.
-, 1946. A catalogue of the Hesperioidea of Venezuela. *Bol. ent. Venezolana* 5: 65-204.
- Butler, A. G., 1870. The genera of Hesperidæ in the collection of the British Museum. *Ent. mon. mag.* 7: 92-99.
- Clench, H. K., 1948. Notes on some Michigan butterflies. *Lepid. news* 2: 105.
- Comstock, J. A., 1956. Notes on metamorphoses of the giant skippers (Lepidoptera; Megathyminæ) and the life history of an Arizona species. *Bull. so. Calif. acad. sci.* 55: 19-27, pl.8.
- dos Passos, C. F., 1947. Notes on Grinnell's types of *Erynnis* Schrank (Lepidoptera, Hesperiidæ). *Amer. mus. novitates* 1337: 3 pp.
- Druce, H., 1881-1900. Insecta. Lepidoptera-Heterocera. in Godman, F. D., & O. Salvin (eds.), *Biologia Centrali-Americana*, vol.2 (1891-1900): [4] + 622 pp.; vol.3 (1881-1900): [4] pp. + 101 pls. (colored). Taylor & Francis, London.
- Ehrlich, P. R., 1958. The comparative morphology, phylogeny and higher classification of the butterflies (Lepidoptera: Papilionoidea). *Univ. Kansas sci. bull.* 39: 305-370, 64 figs.
- Evans, W. H., 1949. *A catalogue of the Hesperiidæ from Europe, Asia and Australia in the British Museum (Natural History).* xx + 502 + [4] (corrigenda) pp., 52 pls. (11 colored). British Museum (Nat. Hist.), London.
-, 1951-1955. *A catalogue of the American Hesperiidæ indicating the classification and nomenclature adopted in the British Museum (Natural History).* Part I (1951): x + 92 pp., pls.1-9; Part II (1952): vi + 178 pp., pls.10-25; Part III (1953): vi + 246 pp., pls.26-53; Part IV (1955): vi + 500 + 4 pp. (addenda & corrigenda), pls.54-88. British Museum (Nat. Hist.), London.
- Freeman, H. A., 1945. Notes on some Hesperiidæ, with new records for the United States (Lepidoptera, Rhopalocera). *Ent. news* 56: 102-104.
-, 1950. The distribution of *Wallengrenia otho* (Abbot & Smith) and its subspecies in the United States (Lepidoptera, Rhopalocera, Hesperiidæ). *Field & Lab.* 18: 78.
- Kirby, W. F., 1871. *A synonymic catalogue of diurnal Lepidoptera.* viii + 690 pp. John van Voorst, London.

- Klots, A. B., 1951. *A field guide to the butterflies of North America, East of the Great Plains*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, xvi + 350 pp., 40 pls. (16 colored).
- Lindsey, A., E. L. Bell, & R. C. Williams, Jr., 1931. The Hesperioidea of North America. *Denison univ. bull., journ. sci. labs.* 26: 1-142, 33 pls.
- Lintner, J. A., 1878. On some species of *Nisoniades*. *30th ann. rep. New York state mus. nat. hist.*: 172-178.
- McDunnough, J. H., 1938. Check list of the Lepidoptera of Canada and the United States of America. Part 1 Macrolepidoptera. *Mem. so. Calif. acad. sci.* 1: 1-273 + (corrigenda).
- Orfila, R. N., & N. H. Rossi, 1956. Nuevos nombres genéricos en Lepidoptera. *Rev. soc. ent. Argentina* 19: 27-29.
- Scudder, S. H., 1872. A systematic revision of some of the American butterflies, with brief notes on those known to occur in Essex County, Mass. *Report Peabody acad. sci. for 1871*: 24-82.
-, 1889. *The butterflies of the eastern United States and Canada with special reference to New England*. 3 vols.: xliv + 1958 pp., 92 pls., 3 maps. Published by author, Cambridge.
- Walker, F., 1856. *List of the . . . Lepidopterous insects in the . . . British Museum (Natural History)*: pt.7: 1508-1808. British Mus. (Nat. Hist.), London.
- Wallace, A. R., 1876. *The geographical distribution of animals, with a study of the relations of living and extinct faunas as elucidating the past changes of the Earth's surface*. 2 vols., illust. London.
- Warren, B. C. S., 1947. Some principles of classification in Lepidoptera, with special reference to the butterflies. *Entomologist* 80: 208-217; 235-241; 262-268; 280-282.

Washington Corners, Mendham, N. J., U. S. A.

DANAUS GILIPPUS IN OHIO

On July 1, 1959, Brother DONALD RAY GEIGER found a specimen of *Danaus gilippus* (Cramer) on a gravel road on the grounds of The Pontifical College Josephinum located in Sharon Township, Franklin County, Ohio, a few miles north of Columbus. The insect was easily captured in the fingers.

The specimen was given to me and has been deposited in the entomological collection at The Ohio State University. The insect is in excellent condition, except for a small piece broken from one of the hind wings.

Dr. EDWARD S. THOMAS, Ohio State Museum, examined the specimen with me. Adequate comparative material was not available, but the white edging of the veins of the upper sides of the hind wings and the relatively large spots in the border of them led us to assign the specimen to the southwestern race *strigosus* Bates.

One can only speculate on the means by which this lepidopteran reached the Columbus area, a locality which is far distant from the insect's normal range. So far as I can ascertain this is the first recorded occurrence of this species for Ohio.

WILLIAM M. GILBERT, Dept. of Entomology & Parasitology, Univ. of California, Berkeley 4, Calif., U. S. A.